

Remarks

This REQUEST FOR CONTINUED EXAMINATION and RESPONSE is in reply to the Office Action mailed October 4, 2006. A Petition for Extension of Time is submitted herewith, together with the appropriate fee.

I. Summary of Examiner's Rejections

Prior to the Office Action mailed October 4, 2006, Claims 24-29, 63-64, and 68-73 were pending in the Application. In the Office Action, Claims 24-25, 63-64, and 68-69 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 24-29, 63-64, and 68-73 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 24-29, 63-64, and 68-73 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being unpatentable over Singer et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,557,009, hereafter Singer) and Monson-Haefel (Enterprise JavaBeans, 2nd Edition), or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Singer in view of Monson-Haefel.

II. Summary of Applicant's Amendment

The present Response amends Claims 24-25, 63-64, and 68-69, leaving for the Examiner's present consideration Claims 24-29, 63-64, and 68-73. Reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to prosecute any originally presented or canceled claims in a continuing or future application.

III. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112

In the Office Action mailed October 4, 2006, Claims 24-25, 63-64, and 68-69 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 24-25, 63-64, and 68-69 have been amended as shown above, and it is respectfully submitted that these Claims, as amended, conform to the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

IV. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §101

In the Office Action mailed October 4, 2006, Claims 24-29, 63-64, and 68-73 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 24, 63, and 68 have been amended as shown above. It is respectfully submitted that, as amended,

Claims 24-29, 63-64, and 68-73 conform to the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §101. Reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

V. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102 and 35 U.S.C. §103

In the Office Action mailed October 4, 2006, Claims 24-29, 63-64, and 68-73 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being unpatentable over Singer et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,557,009, hereafter Singer) and Monson-Haefel (Enterprise JavaBeans, 2nd Edition), or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Singer in view of Monson-Haefel.

Claim 24

Claim 24 has been amended by the present Response to more clearly define the embodiment therein. As amended, Claim 24 defines:

24. *(Currently Amended) A method for generating a unified user profile for providing transparent access to a user or application transparent access to a personalization database and an external user database, said method comprising the steps of:*

(a) obtaining a first business logic component adapted to work through a personalization server to access said personalization database, wherein said first business logic component provides a transparent interface to a user or application through which implicit and explicit properties can be retrieved from and updated in the personalization database, and further wherein the access is carried out independent of any knowledge of the user or application of the naming convention of data in the personalization database;

(b) generating a unified user profile by creating a second business logic component to extend the first business logic component such that said implicit and explicit properties can further be transparently retrieved from and updated in an external user database independent of any knowledge of the user or application of the naming convention of data in the external user database;

(c) wherein the first business logic component and the second business logic component allow the user or application to access data in the personalization database and the external user database independent of any knowledge of the data's location;

(d) wherein the first business logic component uses a property set, said property set adapted to give namespace qualifications to implicit and explicit properties of said data in said personalization database; and further wherein said implicit and explicit properties comprise getter and setter properties; and

(e) obtaining a security realm adapted to allow authentication of data in said personalization database and said external user database.

Claim 24 has been amended to more clearly define the embodiment as comprising obtaining a first business logic component, generating a unified user profile by creating a second business logic component to extend the first business logic component such that implicit and explicit properties can further be transparently retrieved from and updated in an external database independent of any knowledge of the user or application of the naming convention of data in the external user database, and obtaining a security realm. The first and second business logic components allow the user or application to access data in the databases without knowledge of the data's location. The extended first business logic component uses a property set adapted to give namespace qualifications to implicit and explicit properties of data in the personalization database. Applicant respectfully submits that these features are not disclosed by the cited references.

The advantages of the embodiment defined by Claim 24 include that transparent access to a personalization database and an external user database is provided to a user or application. A transparent interface is provided to a user or application through which implicit and explicit properties can be transparently retrieved from and updated in both the personalization database and the external user database independent of any knowledge of the naming convention of data in the databases. Furthermore, the two business logic components allow the user or application to access data in the two databases without having to know where the data is located.

Singer discloses a system for remote, web-based users to access and submit data in an environmental regulatory permitting or management system (Abstract). The system includes a permit database, and fee payments in the system can be made electronically in real-time through the permitting system using a payment system (Abstract).

It appears from the above description that Singer only discloses the use of one database, because the payment system disclosed in Singer is not a database nor does it control a database. There is no mention in column 8, lines 30-43 of Singer of the payment system being or controlling a database. Rather, the payment system is described as executing electronic

payment transactions with a credit card authorization company to validate credit card information (col. 4, lines 53-63, and col. 8, lines 30-41). Thus, it appears the payment system only communicates payment information to a credit card authorization company but does not appear to be or control any databases. Furthermore, nothing is retrieved from or updated in the payment system because the payment system serves only to verify credit card information sent to the payment system. The Office Action cites fields with and without asterisks in figure 3G of Singer as disclosing implicit and explicit properties. However, information in those fields is only sent to the payment system to be verified. Singer does not disclose retrieving or updating information in the fields from the payment system.

In addition, Claim 24 has been further amended to define wherein the first business logic component and the second business logic component allow the user or application to access data in the personalization database and the external user database independent of any knowledge of in which database the data is stored. It is respectfully submitted that this feature is not disclosed by the cited references.

Monzel-Haefel discloses general technical concepts related to Enterprise JavaBeans. While Monzel-Haefel discloses the action of setting class names, such as the Enterprise Bean class name or the Home Interface class name (p. 80-81), Monzel-Haefel does not appear to disclose a property set adapted to give namespace qualifications to implicit and explicit properties of data in a personalization database.

In view of the comments provided above, Applicant respectfully submits that the embodiment defined by Claim 24 is neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 63 and 68

The comments provided above with respect to Claim 24 are hereby incorporated by reference. Claims 63 and 68 have been similarly amended to more clearly define the embodiments therein. For similar reasons as provided above with respect to Claim 24, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 63 and 68, as amended, are likewise neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 25-29, 64, and 69-73

Claims 25-29, 64, and 69-73 are not addressed separately, but it is respectfully submitted that these claims are allowable as depending from an allowable independent claim and further in view of the comments provided above. Applicant respectfully submits that Claims

25-29, 64, and 69-73 are similarly neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. It is also respectfully submitted that these claims also add their own limitations which render them patentable in their own right. Applicant respectfully reserves the right to argue these limitations should it become necessary in the future.

VI. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

Enclosed is a PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for extending the time to respond up to and including April 4, 2007.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 4, 2007

By: /Guanyao Cheng/
Guanyao Cheng
Reg. No. 58,555

Customer No. 23910
FLIESLER MEYER LLP
650 California Street, 14th Floor
San Francisco, California 94108
Telephone: (415) 362-3800